



IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of : Oliver SCHADT et al.

Serial No.: 10/552,064

Group Art Unit: 1609

Filed: October 5, 2005

Examiner: JARRELL, Noble E.

Title: SUBSTITUTED PYRAZOLE COMPOUNDS

**REPLY**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


SIR:

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 14, 2007, applicants elect with traverse Group III, claims 1-7, 10, 14 and 17, drawn to compounds as defined in the Office Action. As a species, applicants elect with traverse compound 8 of example 7 (see page 29 of specification). The traversal is on the grounds that the patent office has not established that it would pose an undue burden to examine the full scope of the claimed invention.

Additionally, applicants bring the attention of the Examiner to MPEP § 821.04, Rejoinder, which states that "if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims [both process of making and using] which either depend from or include all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined." If the restriction requirement is maintained at this point, rejoinder of the non-elected claims is respectfully requested at the proper time in accord with the rejoinder provisions of the MPEP.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Esaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908  
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969  
Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
Direct Dial: 703-812-5331  
Facsimile: 703-243-6410

Attny. Docket No.: Merck-3067  
Filed: April 3, 2007

K:\MERCK\3000 - 3999\3067\REPLY.DOC